

Remarks/Arguments:

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed May 7, 2007.

The examiner indicated that should claims 5-7 be found allowable, claims 28-30 and 48-50 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof.

Claims 28-30 have been amended to be dependent on claim 21. Claims 48-50 have been amended to be dependent on claim 40.

Applicant is advised that should claim 60 be found allowable, claim 67 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof.

Claim 67 is believed to have a different claim scope than claim 60. Claim 67 includes the feature of “instructions”.

Claim 80 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 80 has been rewritten as a machine readable medium claim.

Claims 1-80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Anuff, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,327,628).

The examiner points to figure 4 of Anuff, et al. as indicating “rendering the first control according to the theme; rendering any descendents of the first control according to the theme; wherein any descendents of the first control can override the theme” as claimed in independent claims 1, 21, 54 and 80. This feature is not shown in the Anuff reference. Figure 4 of Anuff shows a hierarchy, but does not show the inheritance of a theme in the hierarchy.

Claim 40 includes the feature “traversing the representation, wherein the traversing comprises: associating a first theme with a first control in the plurality of controls; rendering the

first control according to the first theme; associating a second theme with a second control in the plurality of controls; rendering the second control according to the second theme; and wherein the second control is a descendant of the first control”. This is not shown or made obvious by Anuff. Figure 4 of Anuff shows a hierarchy, but not the display of different themes in the hierarchy.

The dependent claims are believed to be allowable because they are dependent on the independent claims and because of their additional limitations.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 16, 2007

By: /Joseph P. O'Malley/
Joseph P. O'Malley
Reg. No. 36,226

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800